DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 288 SP 034 058

AUTHOR Lemlech, Johanna K.; And Others
TITLE The Los Angeles Professional Practice School: Impact of Teacher Education on Staff Development.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Collegiality; Cooperating Teachers; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Elementary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *School Restructuring; Student Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Recruitment; Time Management
IDENTIFIERS *Professional Development Schools; Professionalization of Teaching; University of Southern California

ABSTRACT

The Norwood-University of Southern California Professional Practice School (PPS) project began in 1990-1991. Norwood is an inner-city elementary school in Los Angeles with a student population that is 99 percent Hispanic. Initial efforts to achieve a major project goal--to promote professionalization of teachers--focused on building collegial relationships between school and university participants. The foundation of the PPS was a restructuring effort focusing on curriculum and instructional improvement. Creating a professional practice school requires a new kind of collaboration between school- and university-based participants. This collaboration has been affected by the diverse perspectives held by participants on a number of issues. In this paper, issues and perspectives associated with three major emphases of the school's restructuring efforts--the study of teaching, teacher decision making, teacher professionalism--are addressed. Perspectives on additional issues and activities are also related and discussed: a problem-solving clinic for student teachers, teacher empowerment, teacher assessment, student assessment, cooperating teacher recruitment, time, and the effect of the PPS on practices in the school and in the university's preservice education program. (Contains 40 references.) (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351288

The Los Angeles Professional Practice School: Impact of Teacher Education on Staff Development

by

Johanna K. Lemlech, Hillary Hertzog-Foliart and Arlene Hackl

Dr. Lemlech and Dr. Hertzog-Foliart are at the University of Southern California; Ms. Hackl teaches at the Norwood-USC Professional Practice School.

This paper was prepared for and presented at the 1992 Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, California.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Johanna K. Lemlech
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SB34058

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Los Angeles Professional Practice School:
Impact of Teacher Education on Staff Development

How likely is it that teachers and teacher educators, jointly, will assume responsibility for restructuring a school-within-a school to model professional practice? Can norms of colleagueship, openness and trust be developed between campus-based educators and inner city teachers to accomplish the aims of restructuring (See Lieberman and Miller, 1990)? In a school-within-a school organizational structure, will teachers assume responsibility for making decisions related to teaching and learning processes, school environments, use and management of resources, and assessment of teacher and student performance? (Holmes Group, 1990; Sykes, 1990; McLaughlin, 1991; Marsh and Odden, 1991). How will faculty in the elementary school relate to their faculty as a whole? How can student teachers contribute to the project? Will there be reciprocal effects on the practices of project teachers and university teacher educators? Will fundamental beliefs about teaching be altered as a consequence of the collaboration?

These are but a few of the questions that have helped to both focus and distress the participants of the Los Angeles Professional Practice School project. Begun in the 1990-91 academic year, the Norwood-University of Southern California (USC) Professional Practice School (PPS) was funded by American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the Exxon Corporation. Norwood is an inner city elementary school serving an Hispanic student population of 1300 (99%). The school is situated one mile from the USC campus.

The aims of the project, as conceived by AFT, are to improve instructional programs for children, provide a professional environment for the education of student teachers and to promote inquiry on teaching (Levine, (1988). These aims are consonant with both the current literature on the restructuring of schools and the professionalization of teaching. The Los Angeles site was selected 1) because of the USC Collegial Teacher Education Program which focuses on collegial relationships and teacher leadership and 2) because of the established relationship between the university and the elementary school.

Review of the Literature

Restructuring and Professionalism

The Professional Practice School, AFT designation, or Development School as described by the Holmes Group, was invented as a means to change the organizing structure of schools by focusing on the work of teachers, expectations for students, and the organization and management of the schooling enterprise (Elmore, 1990; Holmes Group, 1988). Motivation for reforming schools occurred as a consequence of the undistinguished performance of American students, prevailing economic conditions in the United States, and disinterest in teaching as a career choice (Elmore, 1990).

A combination of business groups, teacher organizations, university and political leaders have advocated reform efforts, but much of the research literature agrees that the concept of restructuring defies precise definition and there is no

prescription for making it happen (Elmore, 1990; Hawley, 1990; Joyce, 1991).

Reform efforts of the 1980s advocated longer school days, higher graduation requirements, and efforts to improve test scores. In contrast, the reform efforts of the 1990s are focusing on teacher empowerment, teaching processes and professionalism (Cuban, 1990; Holmes Group, 1990; Shulman, 1987). While some efforts to restructure schools have centered on staffing plans and administrative structures, there is considerable recognition that improved student performance requires foci on the study of teaching, teacher decision making, and professionalism (Hawley, 1990; Newmann, 1991).

Discussions of professionalism emphasize the knowledge base of teaching, complexities of pedagogical processes and the content domains of teaching. (See Shulman, 1987 and 1990 for a discussion of teacher expertise.) To foster teacher professionalism, Sykes (1990) observed that there must be a concept of teacher authority, public regard of teachers and recognition of teachers' knowledge. The nonroutinization of teaching requires that teachers exercise considerable judgement concerning curriculum and pedagogical processes. Zumwalt (1989) concurs noting that in the guise of school improvement there is often the tendency to control teacher behavior, thereby limiting teachers' autonomy to make appropriate decisions about teaching. This, in turn, lessens teacher responsibility for decision making.

Another aspect of professionalism has to do with reflective practice. This theme has been common among educators, since Dewey (1933), as a means to critically examine one's own behavior. Schon's texts (1983, 1987) have popularized the notion of reflective practice as an attribute of professionalism. A number of preservice teacher education programs have attempted to develop reflective practice in order to help prospective teachers make better decisions about teaching (Yinger & Clark, 1981; Tom, 1985; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). None of these programs, however, attempted to link reflective practice with collegial relationships. The Collegial Teacher Education Program at USC pairs student teachers for their student teaching experience in a single elementary classroom. The program was designed to create a bond between partner student teachers to enhance their ability to become professionals and teacher-leaders. Collegial student teaching attempts to match desired outcomes with the training experience. The beginning study of partner student teachers identified helping and reflective interactive behaviors (Lemlech & Kaplan, 1990). The ongoing study of student teachers' collegial interactions has identified sequenced behavioral patterns. The patterns provide insight on the infrastructure of collegiality; six formative stages have been identified (Lemlech & Kaplan, 1991). The four year study of collegiality has demonstrated that collegial relationships (stages 4,5, and 6) generate reflective thinking about teaching processes (Lemlech & Kaplan, 1990, 1991). Would understanding of

the collegial process inform the development of a professional practice school?

The Los Angeles Professional Practice School

How do a school and university begin the transformation from separate institutions to a collaborative endeavor to promote professionalization of teachers? After receiving the grant in July, 1990, our initial efforts focused on the building of collegiality between school and university participants. The issue of roles and responsibilities quickly surfaced. Traditional norms were anticipated by some, and as the project began, were sometimes reinforced. The university assumed the role of participant researchers tracking the progress of the project. The school site personnel focused on maintaining the norm of individual autonomy for classroom decision making.

Suspicion of goals and motives surfaced. For example, one participant commented:

> "I'm not sure how the USC professors see the term restructuring. I see a lot of power play from both ends - the University and AFT and we are caught in the middle. I'm not clear how USC is planning to incorporate this (the project)."

The need for the development of colleagueship, openness and trust was immediately apparent. Initiated by the university participants, individual interviews were conducted with all project members. Goals were discussed and listed. This information was shared and participants were asked to prioritize goals according to

their level of importance. At our first meeting this information was shared; common goals for the project were identified and substantive conversation about those goals took place. Using a form of backward mapping (Elmore, 1980), discussion focused on what the curriculum and instructional program in a model school environment might look like. Together we began to discover that common goals existed among university and school-based participants. As trust began to build, openness increased. Conversation focused on issues related to the study of teaching. The development of collegiality had begun. The focus of our restructuring effort became the curriculum and instructional program. This would serve as the foundation of the Professional Practice School and the glue that would hold us together.

Varied Perspectives

Creating professional practice schools requires a new kind of collaboration between school site and university participants. Both are expected to change organizational structure, alter the pattern of relationships that characterized past associations, and rethink what the education for new teachers should be. In the words of Neufeld, ". . . the formation of professional practice schools will not be a straightforward organizational or conceptual task. For the parties involved, it will be an adventure that requires a good bit of risk-taking, a tolerance for not 'getting it right' the first time, and a firm commitment to the long-term goals" (1990, p. 142).

It is logical that as we engage in collaborative activity at the PPS, the school based and university participants will bring to

that activity not only multiple perspectives of the disciplines of knowledge, varied beliefs, but antecedent experiences which will affect interaction. It is equally logical to assume that having collaborated in different ways in the past concerning a variety of topics, our perspectives regarding that collaboration will differ. Analysis of these perspectives is critical to understanding the development of a Professional Practice School. We, therefore, find it most useful to offer a discussion of the issues we have thus far encountered from the sometimes diverse perspectives of the university participant and the school based participant. To do this three major emphases of restructuring efforts will be addressed: the **study of teaching, teacher decision making, and teacher professionalism;** within each area, issues will be identified.

The Study of Teaching

From the beginning of the project, our efforts have been focused on the study of teaching as a means of school improvement. Investigation of teaching and learning processes, the language of teaching, beliefs about teaching, and how student teachers should engage in the study of teaching have dominated our staff development conversations. However, while our discussions centered on our common interests, different perspectives and values were apparent. Examination of various issues illustrates our attempts to share our varied perspectives and draw from them a plan for what the Professional Practice School should be.

Teaching and Learning Processes

University Perception

When the project began we recognized that some school-based participants questioned university motivation for participation in the project. While we were aware that the instructional program needed to be the creation of the teachers who would be teaching it, we wanted a teaching center for student teachers where the cooperating teachers would engage in reflective supervision, where the program reflected current research about teaching and learning and would reinforce recent trends in curriculum and pedagogy (Zeichner & Liston, 1985). During the past several years, the USC Teacher Education Program was emphasizing models of teaching and collegial professional development in order to help new teachers assume responsibility for leadership and decision making. We were concerned that our students have an internship in a rich environment conducive to the study of teaching. However, as project participants, we were hesitant to express our opinions.

As the teachers discussed their instructional goals at the initial goal setting session, we were reassured that we shared many of the same beliefs. Through much discussion, the planned and evolving instructional program centered on the development of a thinking curriculum organized around thematic units which would integrate disciplines and use a variety of instructional strategies. However, realization of this "idealized" program has moved slowly. It is frustrating for university-based educators to

be observers rather than participants in the curriculum development process.

An exciting part of the instructional program planned during the first year of the project was the development of a club program, the purpose of which was to empower the children by giving them curriculum choices through an elective program. As initially planned, teachers and student teachers were to lead clubs in special areas of personal expertise to cross-age groups of children who would choose to engage in the study of something unusual and of great personal interest. These "learning modules" would be repeated throughout the school year so that children would have the opportunity to study several different areas of interest. Organizational problems with track placement of teachers and time issues delayed the realization of this concept. Finally, during the Spring semester we were able to partially accomplish this goal by using student teachers and two faculty members to teach the clubs. What had begun as a concept to meet goals for student learning was reduced to a means to resolve issues related to time. This serves as an example of how organizational problems encroach upon philosophical concepts as a site attempts to restructure while daily business continues. (See Elmore, 1991, for a discussion of how routinized organizational practices inhibit new ideas and change.)

Teacher Perspective

Our time together has helped us determine our instructional aims in the context of thematic units that relate to a specific

curriculum orientation; Various curriculum conceptions have been explored in order to identify and validate individuals' preferred conception. For the most part, we tend to favor an orientation linked with our school mission, that is, the cognitive processes development approach. It has been very challenging and sometimes frustrating to teach to that approach in a consistent manner. There is still that tendency to backslide and teach as before, or as one was taught. But meeting to develop thematic units favoring that approach has helped us reflect on our practices, expand our thinking and actually reach some of our goals.

The Language of Teaching

Like all professions, teaching reflects a language unique to itself; like all languages, it evolves over time. At the Professional Practice School we have found that the language of teaching has significantly affected the study of teaching.

University Perception

Prior to the creation of the PPS, Norwood was a site for USC student teachers and PPS teachers were our students' supervising teachers. Student teachers brought with them to the Norwood classrooms, a language of teaching which differs from older or more traditional descriptions of teaching. Probably the best example of this was the student teachers' use and talk about Joyce and Weil's models of teaching (1986). On an informal and individual basis, discussion between the university coordinator and the supervising teachers about current language descriptions and teaching models preceded the PPS grant. Once the project was underway, several

project teachers requested that university members allot time to explain and demonstrate particular models of teaching. This has led to several project teachers' experimentation with the models in their own classrooms. Most importantly, it has been interesting to hear the discussion between student teachers and project teachers become enriched and consonant as they share mutual language symbols and descriptions.

Teacher Perception

During some of our time together the university participants have shared with us various models of teaching consonant with our school mission. Thus far these models have included Group Investigation, Concept Attainment, Advance Organizer and Synectics. We feel it is our task to be well versed in these models, not only for demonstration purposes, but also for the sake of ensuring that our instructional aims match our pedagogical strategies.

Another teacher perspective:

It is comforting to know that student teachers are learning alternatives to the seven step lesson plan. They greatly benefit from observing and interacting with a master teacher who has mastered and regularly practices appropriate models of teaching and who regularly reflects on his/her practices.

Effects on Teacher Education

Bringing together university faculty and school-based practitioners to reflect on the study of curriculum and teaching practices has implications both for children and preservice

education. The following perceptions describe how our partnership has influenced practices.

University Perception

The Professional Practice School has influenced the USC teacher preparation program in several ways. Though university coordinators interact with all of our students' supervising teachers, conversations at other training sites are by necessity, brief and related to the specific teaching partners. With project teachers our conversations about teaching and preparation for teaching are intense and sustained. We are able to focus on how individuals learn to teach; is there a developmental pattern? Project teachers are able to give us important feedback about "what our students know and understand about teaching" and "what they do not know or misunderstand." This insight helps us make immediate adjustments in the student teachers' curriculum and methods class. (In addition, see the discussion about problem-solving clinics.)

Another area of impact has occurred through our discussions about the Hispanic population at Norwood, bilingualism, and second language learning. We have explored special needs of the Hispanic child, values, and corresponding school activities. While our student teachers learn several language acquisition models and sheltered English strategies, they are in need of specific cultural information, historical, and linguistic knowledge to help them appreciate the Spanish language, culture, and life experiences. Project teachers will be helping us with content ideas and may be providing some Spanish language teaching to help student teachers

use Spanish in the content fields. In addition, bilingual project teachers are serving on our entrance screening committees to evaluate prospective student teachers' use of Spanish. We are seeking more bilingual teacher candidates, and project teachers are contributing ideas for recruitment.

Another area of impact on the teacher education program has been the collaborative development of Problem-solving Clinics for student teachers assigned not only at Norwood, but at other school sites. As a result of increased reflection with project teachers about current issues student teachers should address, based upon what student teachers do not know and their misconceptions, a series of clincs were conceptualized. Content for the clinics has been developed by a team of university and school-based participants, and it is sometimes taught by project teachers at the school site.

Teacher Perspective

Our involvement with teacher education and the study of how student teachers learn to teach has made a significant impact on our own professional practice at Norwood. We have reviewed models of teaching and have seen how to implement them. We have become aware of the value of peer coaching and the need to foster collegial relationships.

A major component of the student teaching experience at the Professional Practice School has been the development of Problem-solving Clinics for student teachers. In these clinics, students typically come together to explore areas of concern, share

experiences and put into practice the suggestions offered each other. The clinics have had a definite impact on the project teachers, as some of us have helped write cases and lead seminars. This puts a fair amount of pressure on in-service professionals to keep current on educational issues and help identify causes of (and remedies for) poor student achievement and other classroom concerns. Recently a team of project colleagues was asked to lead a seminar on developing thematic units. Student teachers suggested various themes or big ideas, and then voted for their preference. They chose the theme of relationships, and the project teachers went to work in front of the student teachers, debating the possible generalizations and correspondent learning activities to integrate subject fields. In the planning discussion between the two project teachers, they referred many times to their need to develop their own materials and to consult outside sources for the materials and knowledge they were lacking. Thus, student teachers witnessed a practical example of collegial interaction focused on planning for active, integrated and interdisciplinary learning experiences. The student teachers' task was to return to their respective schools and attempt the same type of planning with their collegial pairmates.

Decision Making

In our discussions of school improvement, three major issues have affected project participant interactions during all-day meetings. Lengthy discussions have focused on 1) student evaluation, 2) time and scheduling, and 3) project recruitment and

membership. Two of these issues were particularly tension producing. (See Elmore, 1990 for a discussion of the internal tensions of school restructuring.)

Assessment

University Perception

Initial hesitance by project teachers to consider different means to evaluate students, surprised the university participants. After agreeing so enthusiastically concerning the focus of project efforts on improving the curriculum and instructional practices, we were unprepared for the teachers' willingness to rely on district use of standardized testing for evaluation and assessment of student learning (See Perrone, 1991). We hoped that as the study of teaching processes progressed, interest in alternative assessment would be generated, and project teachers would feel comfortable with abandoning school norms. As the project progressed individual project members assumed leadership to discuss the integration of assessment with teaching and learning.

At a recent all-day meeting, several teacher participants led the session focused on authentic assessment. They prepared exhibits and engaged project participants in discussion of ways to have children demonstrate through production what they are learning. This was a fine example of teachers taking charge of their staff development time, making key decisions about what they want to study. However, actual implementation of their plans is slow.

Teacher Perspective.

Built into our planning is the issue of authentic assessment. We have come to base our evaluation of student achievement on student performance and products, as such evaluation is congruent with learning activities involving exploration, discussion, research and projects. Perhaps our greatest gain is our more recent realization, for the most part, that the learning process itself is more valuable than the end result; that the planned and unplanned learning experiences empower the student as a problem-solver and inventor/creator in his own right.

A sterling example of authentic assessment is the student portfolio-a collection of the student's written projects, self-evaluations and personal reflections on his own education. The portfolio provides concrete evidence of his/her growth over time. It is an instrument utilized at Norwood to affirm the learner as independent and self-fulfilled, one that assists him/her in determining with his teacher what he has accomplished and what he has yet to achieve. It empowers the student to "teach" his parents about his learning experiences at parent conferences, for it is the student (not the teacher!) who makes the evaluative presentation via the portfolio.

Time

The PPS validates that time is a critical component of schooling and of restructuring (Denham & Lieberman, 1980; Barr & Dreeben, 1981; Cohen, 1990). Norwood is an all-year elementary school with four enrollment/teaching tracks. Project teachers are

on different tracks. The consequence of this is that some decisions need to be reconsidered since all teachers are never in attendance at the same staff development sessions. Another consequence of the track system is that all tracks are not congruent with the university calendar.

Teacher Perspective

Since our involvement with the PPS, we have added many new dimensions to our professional lives. We have explored various models of teaching and seen how and when they are most appropriately implemented; we have developed units for thematic, interdisciplinary learning and attempted to link these with authentic assessment; we have become increasingly aware of the role of room environment in the learning process and have made efforts to enrich and relate it to the theme under study. We have addressed the value of peer coaching and collegial relationships; we have attended many planning sessions for the purpose of exploring and implementing the above practices; we have taken on student teachers and have attempted to role model these practices, and we have developed some of the content for the problem-based clinics attended by student teachers.

Our own students continue to need "quality time" with us on an individualized basis before and after school, as do their parents. We need to maintain and increase collegial relationships with non-PPS faculty requiring our input and assistance in other school related matters. Though we are a "school-within-a school," we have not ceased to be an active and necessary part of the rest of the

school, especially now that we have received much development and have much to offer.

Where is the time for all of this? Assuming that our goal is not merely to "cover the bases," how can we accomplish all the goals we have set for ourselves with the high degree of quality that the PPS seeks to develop? We are constantly experimenting with ways to "generate" time. Recently student teachers began conducting activity clubs in our classrooms so our children could pursue a hobby of their choice. The clubs have had many positive results. The student teachers have enriched their own experience and that of the children in new and different ways; we, the project teachers have enjoyed hosting the activities in our rooms and sharing in the delight of our students.

Timewise, our greatest gain from the clubs is the hour-or-so a week free from our teaching responsibilities. It has helped ease the planning crunch, but obviously it is not enough. We have looked, also, at ways to "bank" time, by beginning school fifteen minutes earlier, five days per week, in order to dismiss the students seventy-five minutes early one day per week. This plan would free the project teachers from their lunch period on to deal with project goals, such as co-planning thematic units, peer coaching, assisting in problem-based clinics. Banking time is currently one of the issues Norwood School is addressing in its school-based management program. However, to date, the Los Angeles Unified School District has not consented to the plan, though we are hopeful that the District will eventually change its posture.

University Perspective

The quality of usable time is certainly at the mercy of the organizational structure; the project confirms the "nested layer" concept of Barr & Dreeban (1981). At the school site, the issue of "banked" time has an impact on a variety of other programs, school services, and class schedules. For example, will beginning school earlier in the morning affect the free breakfast program? If time were banked in the afternoon, would it affect siblings who need to walk home with project children? How will other teachers at the school react to a special time schedule for project teachers?

Time and time alternatives are also at the mercy of individuals' commitment and independent-dependent-interdependent relationships. (See Little, 1990 and Lemlech & Hertzog-Foliart, 1992). Some project members have teamed to begin the development of thematic units and to practice models of teaching; for others, priorities differ. Agreed upon lunch meetings and after school planning meetings are subject to perceived need (level of commitment); as a result committee meetings are sporadic.

Recruitment

Several teachers who initially were PPS participants decided to withdraw, and because some project teachers are on different tracks which do not correspond to the USC calendar, there is a shortage of qualified supervising teachers for student teaching. Recruitment of new members has been a topic of discussion over the past several months.

Teacher Perspective

The PPS seeks to recruit new members to expand its positive influence on the practice of teaching at Norwood. At present our goal is to have twelve committed teachers who will participate actively and consistently in the project. We now have a little more than half that number. Some teachers have left the project because of the pressing time constraints. It is difficult to recruit new members. Many experienced teachers have expressed interest, but very few are willing to commit their time and energies. Those teachers who wish to join will be required to submit a professional portfolio to current members for discussion and evaluation. It is hoped that as the project group expands, the school as a whole will become enriched and distinguish itself as a proud institution of high expectations and high achievement - for students, student teachers, teachers and administrators alike.

University Perspective

The underlying purpose of a professional practice school is to provide an environment where really good practices are modeled. In particular these "really good practices" relate to the teaching and the content of the curriculum. Other assumptions imbedded in the PPS concept have to do with the relationship of preservice and inservice education, the relationship between university and school practitioners, and ongoing inquiry into best practices. None of these purposes can be accomplished without individuals with vision (Barth, 1990).

Since university teacher educators are as concerned about their students (the student teachers) as school practitioners are about theirs, we consider it important to place our students with "master" teachers. Therefore, we want to recruit the very best teachers in the school district, and we want a free market in which teachers apply for membership. We need to search beyond Norwood to include additional teachers with vision. Though teacher members of the PPS understand our perspective, their concern with faculty relations inhibits recruitment beyond the immediate school.

Professionalism

Once project ownership was established, we needed to concentrate on intra-group relationships. Collegiality within the group would affect the improvement process (Barth, 1990; Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1992; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Sykes, 1990; Schlecty, 1990). Group commitment, decision making, and expressions of empowerment seemed to be heightened and diminished by concerns about relationships with other faculty members, personal feelings of esteem, authority, and efficacy.

Relations With Other Faculty Members

University Perspective

From initial concerns about elitism to later concerns about recruitment, school-based participants have been greatly affected and concerned about their relationships with other school faculty members. Sometimes these concerns preceded the study of teaching and affected our working and collegial relationships.

Teacher Perspectives *(These responses relate first to how project teachers contribute to other faculty members and then some personal responses over the course of the last year and a half.)*

As the faculty (as a whole) attempts to establish School Based Management with an eye toward total school restructuring, the project teachers are now able to give much valuable input in terms of curriculum design and implementation. We share what we have learned about the development of thematic units and authentic assessment, notably portfolio assessment. We endeavor to make our own classrooms models for the rest of the school by creating a room environment that reflects active learning.

Other comments follow:

"(I) become concerned about other faculty members' perceptions of me. Do they see me as a peer apart from them?"

" I find myself taking on leadership positions with confidence and authority. I feel more accepted by the rest of the faculty."

"I am more aggressive about my beliefs and sharing what I have learned. I want them to 'buy into' the thinking curriculum."

"I am both discouraged and encouraged. PPS has been helpful in helping to direct less experienced teachers to look beyond their own classroom."

". . . seems some are resentful of PPS; think it's a big joke!"

Collegiality

As supervising teachers and potential supervising teachers, PPS members were very interested in the functioning of the USC

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Collegial Teacher Preparation Program. Those members who had supervised partner student teachers, recognized that novice teachers gained insight into teaching processes by observing each other. This occurs because responsibility to observe *what* is happening in the classroom leads to reflection about *why* it is happening. The experienced supervising teachers recognized that the neophytes were forced to focus on the "other" instead of just the "self." The content and context of novice teachers' discussions change from the visceral to substantive, reflective conversations.

University Perspective

The study of collegiality among student teachers provided us with insight about what might make a difference in staff development programs with experienced teachers. We recognized that project teachers had cordial and helping relationships with each other, but our experience validated that proximity and helping behaviors do not make individuals colleagues. (See: Little, 1990; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Lemlech & Kaplan, 1990; Lemlech & Hertzog-Foliart, 1992; Zahorik, 1987.)

Our aim for all-day staff development sessions was to facilitate the development of collegial relationships among project participants. To accomplish this, we attempted to cultivate an hospitable environment for significant talk about teaching. A variety of teacher perspectives - over time, describe relations with other PPS members, how beliefs about teaching have been affected by the dialogue, and how actions and feelings have changed concerning professionalism.

Teacher Perspectives

On a personal level, I would venture to say that no project member feels exactly the same about teaching as before. Ever since Norwood came into partnership with USC, there has come to exist a renewed sense of professionalism, of true pride in one's work, that makes our campus an exciting place to be. Teachers have begun to view students as problem solvers who are more likely to learn if they are allowed to have input into their units of study. We see ourselves as colleagues with the adminstration in formulating and assessing educational opportunities and with the university in determining the student teacher's course of study.

From another teacher:

"I have become closer with all of the members and developed a level of trust in working with them and voicing my opinions."

And:

"(I) communicate freely; I do not hide anything - emotions, ideas, etc."

Another:

"A very comfortable rapport has developed between PPS teachers. There is open and candid communications which did not exist before. There is trust."

When asked, how have your beliefs changed about teaching, the following responses were made:

"I see myself as facilitator and coach instead of disseminator of knowledge - feel more committed to and proud of my profession than ever!"

And:

I'm working on finding a balance between process and content - but at least I know I'm not alone.

Another:

"I believe different strategies need to be used to bring about the achievement/product I desire. I value using the different models of instruction in various need settings."

Concerning Professionalism:

"Have a keener sense as to what my role is as a professional person."

And a perspective about professionalism over time:

"(I was) unsure of my status in this area; felt that sufficient experiences were lacking in my career to honestly call myself a prideful professional." And now: "(I) have a renewed, heightened sense of myself and my peers as well-educated, informed professionals."

And:

"I have become more professional because I have more knowledge. I'm more intellectually challenged, and I am associating with "professional" teachers. I believe I always was professional - but now I 'feel' more professional."

Still another:

"By being part of the project I feel that my professionalism has increased. Although I cannot be selective about the students I have, I can make decisions on what my professional development needs are and how to meet them, thanks to the project."

Teacher Assessment

The issue of teacher assessment is tied to the question of recruiting additional teachers to the Professional Practice School. When the issue was discussed the group recognized that there needed to be criteria to determine: who should be a teacher in the Professional Practice School? How should readiness be determined?

University Perspective

The major concern for the university project members was finding additional members who possessed the competencies needed for supervising student teachers. The group agreed to examine criteria used to select them for participation. In addition, they believed that if students were to be assessed through portfolio accomplishments, perhaps teachers could be similarly assessed.

Teacher Perspective

If student portfolios are desireable as proof of reflection and accomplishment, teacher portfolios have equal merit. We have therefore decided that each project teacher will develop a professional portfolio featuring a statement of teaching ideology, sample unit and lesson plans, self-evaluations and statement of future professional goals, peer recommendations, letters from students and parents, photographs of student exhibitions, videotapes of special presentations and evidence of participation in professional development activities, such as: planning thematic units, peer coaching, assisting in problem-based clinics. The portfolio may include any other item that the teacher feels is representative of his professional practice. The teacher will

examine, revise, and update his portfolio as a means of demonstrating competency in the on-going task of self-assessment.

Empowerment

Because empowerment is so closely related to feelings of self-esteem, decision making, and professionalism, the participants were asked to contrast how their actions and feelings had changed. Teacher responses to changes in self-esteem through the life of the project are as follows:

Teacher Perspectives

Beginning of project: "in a state of flux;" Now: "very strong; need to learn to contain some of it."

And:

"My self esteem has definitely gone up. At the start of the project I had good feelings about myself, but I never put myself forward to express my opinion and take an open leadership position, perhaps from fear of rejection. Now I feel confident enough to be open about my opinions and accept comments for my consideration."

Another:

"My self-esteem has improved since I am more knowledgeable about what teaching/learning is."

Conclusions and Implications

This paper has reported through participant perceptions a slice of the chronological case history of the Norwood-USC Professional Practice School. Documentation was achieved through personal observation field notes, participant interviews,

questionnaires, reflective responses to focused quesstions and audio tapes of staff development sessions. The purposes of the larger case study are to help us improve teaching and learning in schools by understanding:

- How does change (restructuring) happen?
- What concomitant changes in teaching practices, beliefs, sense of professionalism go along with structural change?

Effective teaching research of the late 1960s and 1970s influenced policy makers, school districts, teachers in schools and pre-service teacher education programs to focus almost exclusively on basic skill instruction and specific teaching functions (Rosenshine, 1983). As a consequence, teachers (and principals) failed to extend their thinking about significant teaching goals and willingly limited their involvement in key decision making activities that affected students, the school milieu, and their own professional growth. For this reason restructuring efforts have had to convince teachers of their efficacy and their responsibility for decision making (Sykes, 1990). This was the case in this project. We began this report with some basic questions which focused our inquiry. These questions will be repeated to allow comment on some developing patterns.

How likely is it that teachers and teacher educators, jointly, will assume responsibility for restructuring a school-within-a school to model professional practice?

Teachers and teacher educators can work together to accomplish common goals, but parameters need to be clearly defined. The "regularities of schooling" influence the teacher members. For school-based personnel the maintenance of the day-to-day operation of schooling must take precedence, and this takes considerable energy. Needed changes affect school staff much more than university personnel.

Roles, functions, and relationships for group meetings and for implementation decisions need time to develop. Initially, university members found themselves organizing the all-day meetings and planning the agenda, but as the project progressed, school-based members assumed some of the responsibility. Patience is a significant virtue since perceptions, experiences, beliefs of all involved differ, and time is needed to create common group understandings.

Can norms of colleagueship, openness and trust be developed between campus-based educators and inner city teachers to accomplish the aims of restructuring?

Appreciation of what individuals can contribute to each other's education (and professionalism) is an important aspect of a joint relationship. But appreciation doesn't happen until there is openness and trust. Not until you can recognize each other's strengths, and weaknesses, are you able to contribute to each

other's effectiveness and establish a basis for professional collaboration and colleagueship. Open, professional dialogue focused on the study of teaching helps to build these norms. Through our discussions, we were able to meld the competence of experienced teachers with teacher educators' knowledge of current research on teaching to develop a collaborative relationship. Participants in a project, such as this, need to consciously work to keep communication as open as possible.

Will teachers assume responsibility for making decisions related to teaching and learning processes, school environments, use and management of resources, and assessment of teacher and student performance?

Unequivocally, yes. But the assumption of new roles for decision making need to evolve from an understanding of how decisions affect the instructional program and student learning. The assumption of new roles and responsibilities need support and encouragement both internally and externally. University members of restructuring teams need to remember that to some extent they are on the outside, looking in; they can encourage, collaborate, serve as consultants, and exert a modicum of pressure. Internally, principals and district personnel need to facilitate the process by providing time for teachers to take on new and additional responsibilities.

How will project faculty relate to their faculty as a whole?

Not until project members had established group cohesiveness and varying degrees of collegiality were they able to cope with their sense of ostracism by the rest of the faculty stemming from project identification and exclusiveness. Group cohesiveness and collegiality fostered confidence, self esteem, and professionalism. This was ultimately communicated to the rest of the faculty, and project members began to realize the potential to enhance knowledge and professionalism of other faculty.

How can student teachers contribute to restructuring efforts?

The student teachers contributed in very significant ways. Student teachers assumed responsibility to contribute to the school curriculum by enriching children's experiences through the club program. This served to release project teachers for planning responsibilities.

Student teachers also provide a critical link between university professors and school-based educators. The student teachers in this project demonstrated how collegiality develops, how teachers can serve as peer teachers for each other, and how peers can be comfortable and open with each other. In addition, student teachers provide the value-free focus for initial discussions of teaching processes and how individuals learn to teach.

Will there be reciprocal effects on the practices of project teachers and university teacher educators?

Collegial relationships among school-based educators and campus-based educators in this project operationalized these processes:

- Projected the consideration of curriculum and instruction as the focus for restructuring efforts; this opened up the study of what needs to happen in classrooms to improve student performance;
- Collegial relationships help participants "make public" what is happening in classrooms by sharing prideful lessons and gaining comfort recognizing that it is "ok" not to be expert in everything. Campus-based educators can make similar declarations;
- Provided direct (and reciprocal) link from what pre-service teachers study to what is reinforced in practice;
- Illuminated the developmental nature of learning to teach, thereby bolstering efficacy of experienced teachers through greater awareness of what needs to be modeled for the neophyte;
- Identified and expanded the decision making potential of classroom teachers prompting self-esteem and feelings of professionalism.

Will fundamental beliefs about teaching be altered as a consequence of the collaboration?

Shared readings, professional dialogue, presentations, and focused reflection helped project members consider and reassess their beliefs about teaching. No where is the domino theory so evident as in the decision making realm of curriculum and instruction. Once project members came to terms with their idealized curriculum, there was no turning back. Each aim required new insights, new teaching methodologies, new environments and ultimately new assessments, and each new insight and methodology contributed to changing fundamental beliefs affecting classroom practices.

REFERENCES

Barr, R. & Dreeban, R. (1981). School policy, production, and productivity. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Barth, R.S. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, M. (1990) Key issues confronting state policymakers. In R.F. Elmore and Associates (Ed.) Restructuring schools The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cuban, L. (1990). Cycles of history: Equity versus excellence. In S.B. Bacharach (Ed.) Education reform making sense of it all. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Sclan, E. (1992). Policy and supervision. In C.D. Glickman (Ed.). Supervision in transition. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Denham, C. & Lieberman, A. (Eds.) (1980).Time to learn Sacramento, CA: California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.

Elmore, R. F. (1980) Backward Mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. Political Science Quarterly. 94 (4), 601-616.

Elmore, R.F. and Associates. (Eds.) (1990) Restructuring schools The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elmore, R.F. (1991). Teaching, learning, and organization: School restructuring and the recurring dilemmas of reform. Invited

address at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, Ill.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1991). What's worth fighting for? Ontario, Canada: Ontario Teachers' Federation.

Hawley, W.D. (1990). Preparing students from today's families for tomorrow's cognitive challenges. In S.B. Bacharach (Ed.) Education reform making sense of it all.Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Holmes Group. (1988). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Joyce, B.R. (1991). The doors to school improvement. Educational Leadership, 48(8), 59-62.

Joyce, B.R. & Weil, M. (1986). Models of teaching. Third Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lemlech, J.K. & Kaplan, S.N. (1990). Learning to talk about teaching: Collegiality in clinical teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 12(1), 13-19.

Lemlech, J.K. & Kaplan, S.N. (1991). Collegial teacher preparation, reflective practice, and social studies teaching. Paper presented to College, University Faculty Association of the National Council for the Social Studies, Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.

Lemlech, J.K. & Hertzog-Foliart, H. (1992). Restsructuring to become a professional practice school: Stages of collegiality and the development of professionalism. Paper presented at the

annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Levine, M. (1988). Professional practice schools: Building a model. Monograph 1. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1990). Teacher development in professional practice schools. In M. Levine (Ed.) Professional practice schools: Building a model. Volume II. Washinton, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

Little, J.W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. Teachers College Record, 91 (4), 509-536.

McLaughlin, M.W.(1991). Enabling professional development: What have we learned? In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Eds.) Staff development for education in the '90s. Second Ed. NY: Teachers College Press.

Marsh, D. & Odden, A.R. (1991) (in press). In A.jR. Odden (Ed) Educational policy implementation. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Neufeld, B. (1990). Professional practice schools in context: New mixtures of institutional authority. In M. Levine (Ed) Professional practice schools: Building a model Volume II. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

Newmann, F.M. (1991) Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement. Phi Delta Kappan. 72(6), 458-463.

Perrone, V. (1991). Expanding student assessment. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. The Elementary School Journal. 83(4), 335-352.

Schlechty, P.C. (1990). Schools for the 21st century. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. (1983) The reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review 57(1), 1-22.

Shulman, L.S. (1990). Aristotle had it right: On knowledge and Pedagogy. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Sykes, G. (1990). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools. In R.F. Elmore and Associates (Ed.) Restructuring schools The next generation of educaional reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 59-96.

Tom, A. R. (1985). Inquiring into inquiry-oriented teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education. 36(1), 35-44.

Yinger, R.J. & Clark, C.M. (1981). Reflective journal writing: Theory and practice. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Institute for Research on Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208 411.

Zahorik, J.A. (1987). Teachers' collegial interaction: An exploratory study. The Elementary School Journal, 87, 385-396.

Zeichner, K.M. & Liston, D.P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 23-48.

Zeichner, K.M. & Liston, D.P. (1985). Theory and practice in the evolution of an inquiry-oriented student teaching program. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, DC.

Zumwalt, K. (1989).Beginning professional teachers: The need for a curricular vision of teaching. In M.C. Reynolds Knowledge base for the beginning teacher. NY: Pergamon.